COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *NOMADACRIS* UVAROV, 1923 (INSECTA, ORTHOPTERA). Z.N.(S.)2525

(1) By R. E. Blackith (*Zoology Department, Trinity College, Dublin-2, Ireland*)

I further support the case for conservation of the locust generic name *Nomadacris* as stated by Key and Jago (*Bull. Zool. Nom.*, vol. 43, pp. 102–103) and supported by Kevan (*loc. cit.*, p. 104).

Problems of nomenclature relating to organisms of major economic importance should not, I believe, be decided without taking into account the reactions of those concerned with the organism professionally but who are not particularly interested in taxonomic nomenclature. Compilers of reports and reviews on Red Locust ecology and control, indexers and abstractors, report writers for International and Government agencies, and writers on and teachers of ecology may often fall into such a category, and will particularly appreciate stability.

If *Nomadacris* is not formally conserved, I believe that both it and *Patanga* will be used concurrently by different authors in the economic literature, possibly for several years to come, as generic names for the Red Locust. This is not an instance of mild inconvenience for a few specialists accustomed to such matters, but of irritation at best, and confusion at worst, for much larger numbers of workers in Applied Entomology, to the detriment of their work and of the respect in which the Commission is held.

(2) The proposed precedence of *Nomadacris* over *Patanga* has also been strongly supported by Prof. Marcello La Greca (*Dipartimento di Biologia Animale, Universitá di Catania, 95124 Catania, Italy*) and Dr R. F. Chapman (*Agricultural Experiment Station, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, U.S.A.*).

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *CEPHALOPHOLIS ARGUS* SCHNEIDER, 1801 (OSTEICHTHYES). Z.N.(S.)2470

(see vol. 42, pp. 374–378)

By G. F. Mees (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA, Leiden, The Netherlands.*)

In part A, paragraph 2, of the application it is stated that the specific name *guttata* Bloch, 1790: 'Has not been used by authors in spite of its priority over *Cephalopholis argus* Schneider. This was probably due to the realisation that it is preoccupied by *Perca guttata* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 292 . . .'

Actually, *Bodianus guttatus* was used throughout the last century, for example by Valenciennes (in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1828, p. 357); Gunther (1859, p. 119) and Jordan and Evermann (1896, p. 1142). Moreover, these authors recognised *Cephalopholis argus* as a valid species.

Boulenger (1895, p. 189) united the two nominal species *argus* and *guttatus* under the name *Epinephelus argus*. As, in the synonymy, he recorded the year of publication of *B. guttatus* correctly as 1790 with that of *C. argus* as 1801, it may be assumed that Boulenger had recognised the homonymy, although he did not expressly say so.

Weber & de Beaufort (1931, p. 28) stated in the synonymy of the species they listed as *Epinephelus argus: 'Bodianus guttatus* Bloch, Ausl. Fische IV, 1790, p. 36 (nec *guttatus* L.)'. Clearly, if not Boulenger, then certainly Weber & de Beaufort had definitely rejected *Bodianus guttatus* Bloch as a junior secondary homonym and under Article 59b, this name remains permanently invalid.

I submit therefore, that part A and proposals (1)(a) and (4)(a) of the application by Randall *et al.* be withdrawn, as the name they wish to suppress is already permanently invalid.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

JORDAN, D. S. & EVERMANN, B. W. 1896. The fishes of North and Middle America. Part 1. *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol., 37, pp. 1–1240.

WEBER, M. & DE BEAUFORT, L. F. 1931. *The Fishes of the Indo–Australian Archipelago 6*. 448 pp. E. J. Brill, Leiden.

SUPPORT FOR THE REJECTION OF 'HISTOIRE NATURELLE DES SERPENS' (LACÉPÈDE, 1788–1789, AND LATER EDITIONS). Z.N.(S.)1985

By Hobart M. Smith (*E.P.O. Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 8039, U.S.A.*)

The purposes of the proposals set forth in this account (Melville, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 43, pp. 80–83), namely to reject Lacépède's *Histoire naturelle des Serpens* in nomenclatural contexts, but to maintain stability for some names affected by that rejection, are thoroughly justifiable. The work itself clearly does not conform with requirements of the Code, but in the past fear of nomenclatural repercussions of either rejection or unreserved acceptance of the work has prevented decisive action on its status.

Thus the proposals for conservation of the three names long widely adopted that would be affected by rejection of Lacépède's work are vital adjuncts to the latter proposal. *Agkistrodon piscivorus* (from *Crotalus piscivorus* Lacépède), the Cottonmouth of the southeastern United States; *Lampropeltis triangulum* (from *Coluber triangulum* Lacépède), the Milk snake of North, Central and northern South America; and *Python reticulatus* (from *Boa reticulata* Schneider), of southeast Asia and the East Indies, all qualify as *nomina venerata* or, in the case of *Coluber triangulum*, have already been placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology (name no. 2186, Opinion 804, 1967).

Accordingly, I enthusiastically support all proposals pertaining to this case.